

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	
	:	CRIMINAL ACTION
v.	:	
	:	NO. 08-614
HABEEB MALIK	:	
IRA WEINER	:	
THONGCHAI VORASINGHA	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 4th day of December, 2009, upon consideration of Defendant Habeeb Malik's Post-Trial Motion for Judgment of Acquittal Pursuant to Rule 29(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (Doc. No. 104), Defendant Ira Weiner's Motion for Judgment of Acquittal Pursuant to Rule 29, or, in the Alternative, Motion for New Trial Pursuant to Rule 33 (Doc. No. 105), Defendant Thongchai Vorasingha's Joinder in Defendant Ira Weiner, D.O.'s Motion for Judgment of Acquittal Pursuant to Rule 29, or, in the Alternative, Motion for a New Trial Pursuant to Rule 33 (Doc. No. 108), and Defendant Habeeb Malik's Joinder in Defendant Ira Weiner, D.O.'s Motion and Reply Memorandum for Judgment of Acquittal Pursuant to Rule 29, or, in the Alternative, Motion for a New Trial Pursuant to Rule 33 (Doc. No. 117), and all documents submitted in support thereof and in opposition thereto, it is ORDERED as follows:¹

1. Defendant Habeeb Malik's Post-Trial Motion for Judgment of Acquittal Pursuant to Rule 29(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (Doc. No. 104), is DENIED.
2. Defendant Ira Weiner's Motion for Judgment of Acquittal Pursuant to Rule 29, or, in the Alternative, Motion for New Trial Pursuant to Rule 33 (Doc. No. 105), is

¹ Memorandum to follow.

DENIED.

3. Defendant Thongchai Vorasingha's Motion for Judgment of Acquittal Pursuant to Rule 29, or, in the Alternative, Motion for a New Trial Pursuant to Rule 33 (Doc. No. 108), is DENIED.
4. Defendant Habeeb Malik's Motion for Judgment of Acquittal Pursuant to Rule 29, or, in the Alternative, Motion for a New Trial Pursuant to Rule 33 (Doc. No. 117), is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ R. Barclay Surrick
U.S. District Judge